

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-71 were pending. Claims 35-36, 45, 49-50, and 61 have been cancelled; claims 72-78 have been added; and claims 1, 4-6, 19, 28, 32, 34, 41-44, 46, 48, 55, 59-60, 68, and 71 have been amended. Accordingly, claim 1-34, 37-44, 46-48, 51-60, and 62-78 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the present Office Action, claims 4-6, 11, 26-27, 32, 45 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 12-25, 28-44, 46-60 and 62-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,229,593 (hereinafter "Cato"). Applicant respectfully traverses at least some of the above rejections as discussed below. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following comments.

Applicant has provided new and/or amended claims which generally correspond to the allowable subject matter identified by the examiner with certain text also deleted from the claims. For the examiner's convenience, the relationship between the identified allowable subject matter and the amended and/or new claims is illustrated by the following table.

<b>Amended and/or New Independent Claim</b>	<b>Allowable Claim(s)</b>
1	4
19	32

41	45
55	61
68	32
71	32
74	11
75	26
76	27

As seen from the above table, each of the prior independent claims, and new independent claims 74-76, incorporate allowable subject matter identified by the examiner. In particular, (i) claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4; (ii) claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 32; (iii) claim 41 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 45; (iv) claim 55 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 61; (v) claim 68 has been amended to incorporate subject matter corresponding to claim 32; and (vi) claim 71 has been amended to incorporate subject matter corresponding to claim 32. Further, new claim 74 reflects the allowable subject matter of claim 11, new claim 75 reflects the allowable subject matter of claim 26, and new claim 76 reflects the allowable subject matter of claim 27. Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 19, 41, 55, 68, 71, and 74-76 are in condition for allowance.

In addition to the above, Applicant has added new claims 72-73 and 77-78 which include features not taught or suggested by the cited art. For example, claims 72 and 77 generally reflect subject matter corresponding to claim 7. Also, claims 73 and 78 generally reflect subject matter corresponding to claim 9. In the present Office Action, it is suggested that the features of claims 7 and 9 are disclosed by Cato at col. 7, lines 2-3. However, Cato merely discloses:

“At Block 34, the microprocessor 11 generates a unique terminal identification code which is transmitted on the output beam 15. The data On the input beam 21 is then monitored for an initial confirmation

signal, such as a predetermined digital code, indicating that the remotely positioned terminal B has received the output beam 15 (Block 38). If the confirmation signal has not been received (Block 38), the microprocessor 11 again sends the terminal identification code at Block 34 at the low power safety level and monitors for the initial confirmation signal (Block 36).” (Cato, col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 8). (emphasis added).

“In particular, the free space laser communication system includes two spaced-apart terminals. Each terminal may be identical except for a unique terminal identification code.” (Cato, col. 3, lines 28-31).

“The communication terminals A, B may preferably be the same except for a unique identifying code associated with each terminal.” (Cato, col. 4, lines 53-55)

“[T]he microprocessor periodically inserts the terminal's identification code into the data stream to be modulated onto the output beam 15. The identification code is recognized by the remotely positioned terminal B.” (Cato, col. 5, lines 27-29)

As can be seen, Cato merely discloses conveying a terminal identification code and a confirmation signal. Nowhere does Cato disclose or suggest the transmitted information includes orientation information or node position information as recited in the claims. Therefore, Applicant submits the subject matter of prior claims 7 and 9 is not anticipated by Cato and claims 72-73 and 77-78 are allowable over the cited art.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the examiner believe issues remain which would prevent the application from proceeding to allowance, the below signed representative would appreciate, and requests, a telephone interview in order to facilitate a speedy resolution. The below signed representative can be reached at (512) 853-8866.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-16201/RDR.

Also included:

- ☒ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☒ Fee Authorization
- ☒ Return Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



---

Rory D. Rankin  
Reg. No. 47,884  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,  
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: June 2, 2005